UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,825	09/20/2005	Murray Edward Bruce Leighton	THOM-0039	6842
	7590 04/21/200 <b>WASHBURN</b> LLP		EXAMINER	
	E, 12TH FLOOR		PASCUA, JES F	
2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3782	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	10/522,825	LEIGHTON, MURRAY EDWARD BRUCE				
Office Action Gammary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jes F. Pascua	3782				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Ja	nnuary 2008.					
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1,2,4-12 and 15 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-12 is/are withdrawr</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) 15 is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1,2,4 and 5 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>	from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2008 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the correction to the correction to the correction of	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)     Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/522,825 Page 2

Art Unit: 3782

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims 6-12 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in the reply filed on 08/17/2007. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,330,269 to Kamada et al.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Grundschober et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,330,269 to Kamada et al.

Art Unit: 3782

Grundschober et al. discloses the claimed device (see Fig. 9) except for bag having a reclosable zipper. Kamada et al. discloses that it is known in the art to provide peel seal bags with reclosable zippers. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the bag of Grundschober et al. with the reclosable zipper of Kamada et al., in order to make the bag reclosable.

Regarding claim 4, the filament (24) embedded in the adhesive mass (23) in Grundschober et al. meets the recitation "the tear element is coated with a peel seal" to same degree as claimed.

## Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 15 is allowed.

#### Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 01/28/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument that Kamada does not disclose the top being formed by sealing opposed wall portions of the bag together, there is no explicit recitation that the opposed wall portions of the bag be sealed directly to each other. Kamada clearly discloses the opposed bag walls (5) being sealed together via the elongate tear element (4). Moreover, Kamada discloses that it is not necessary for the elongate tear element (4) to extends across the entire width and that the elongate tear

element "may extend over only a portion of the upper part of the pouch 1" (column 5, lines 8-9). The extension of the Kamada elongate tear element over only a portion of the upper part of the pouch would inherently result in the remaining upper part of the pouch to be sealed, which meets the recitation "a top seal which is formed by sealing opposed wall portions of the bag together".

Page 4

In response to applicant's argument that Grundschober et al. includes additional structure not required by Applicant's invention (i.e., adhesive mass (23)), it must be noted that Grundschober et al. discloses the invention as claimed. The fact that it discloses additional structure not claimed is irrelevant. The elongate tear element (24) of Grundschober et al. extends through a portion of the top seal to protrude from the top of the bag to the same degree the claim sets forth the metes and bounds of the "top seal" and the "top of the bag".

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. In this case, Kamada suggests that it is desirable to provide a zipper (10) in order to reseal a bag that has been opened across the entire width of the bag. Although Grundschober et al. discloses resealing of the bag (column 4, lines 48-50), it is noted that resealing is for when a "relatively small discharge opening" has been formed.

There is no explicit disclosure in Grundschober et al. of a resealable means provided after the entire side (23) of the bag has been opened by the elongate tear element (24).

As a note, applicant's statement that the *resealing means* in Grundschober et al. "comprises the adhesive mass 23 in which the elongate element extending along the top edge of the bag is embedded" is not supported by Grundschober et al.

### Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Applicant is duly reminded that a complete response must satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F. R. 1.111, including: "The reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references. A general allegation that the claims "define a patentable invention" without specifically pointing out how the language of the

Application/Control Number: 10/522,825 Page 6

Art Unit: 3782

claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this section. Moreover, "The prompt development of a clear Issue requires that the replies of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims." Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP 714.02 and MPEP 2163.06. The "disclosure" includes the claims, the specification and the drawings.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jes F. Pascua whose telephone number is 571-272-4546. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Newhouse can be reached on 571-272-4544. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/522,825 Page 7

Art Unit: 3782

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jes F. Pascua/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3782